

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Claims 1-45 were originally presented.

No claims are added.

Claims 1-11 and 14-16 remain in this application.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 6,119,135 to Helfman (Helfman). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Helfman further discloses that images may be obtained from an image  
2 cache in a proxy server (see cache 38 of proxy server 34 of Helfman Fig. 3).  
3 Clients (see clients 28, 30, and 32 of Helfman Fig. 3) may be connected to a data  
4 network such as the Internet or an intranet through the proxy server. The clients  
5 contain standard web browsers, where each web browser is configured to use the  
6 particular proxy server as its proxy server. When user browses the Internet, the  
7 web browsers request web pages from the proxy server. The proxy server stores  
8 requested web pages and the images contained in or referenced from those web  
9 pages in the cache. If no local copy of a requested web page exists in the cache,  
10 the proxy server retrieves the requested web page from an appropriate web server  
11 (see web servers 22 and 24 of Helfman Fig. 3). The proxy server may also  
12 maintain a log file that contains the URLs of stored web pages and images.  
13 (Helfman, col. 3, lines 32-54). In other words, web page images can be obtained  
14 from the image cache. The proxy server contains the log file that can be parsed to  
15 construct the mapping list that maps images to associated web pages. (Helfman,  
16 col. 1, line 65 to col., line 2).

17 A montage application (see montage application 40 of Helfman Fig. 3) may  
18 run on each client. The montage application parses the log file maintained by the  
19 proxy server and creates a corresponding mapping list containing the URLs of the  
20 images in cache and the URLs of the web pages associated with those images.  
21 (Helfman, col. 3, lines 58-62).

22  
23  
24  
25

1       **Independent claim 1**, for example, recites “[a] system comprising:

2               a plurality of web servers configured to return first content to  
3       requesting client devices;

4               a central logging server;

5               wherein the returned content includes a reference to second content  
6       from the central logging server; and

7               wherein the central logging server logs requests for the first content  
8       in response to requests for the second content.

9       Helfman fails to teach or disclose the system of claim 1. The Action argues  
10   that Helfman discloses “a plurality of web servers configured to return first  
11   content to requesting client devices” citing “web servers 22 and 24) which “return  
12   first content” in the form of a web page. The Action argues that “a central logging  
13   server” is taught by the proxy server disclosed in Helfman. Furthermore, the  
14   Action argues that the “returned content” or web page includes a reference (the  
15   Action argues that the web page URL is the reference) to “second content”. The  
16   Action argues that “second content” is taught by the images described in Helfman.  
17   The Action also argues that the “central logging server” or proxy server “logs  
18   requests” for the first content (web page) “in response to requests for the second  
19   content”. The Action argues that the URL of the web page is logged upon  
20   retrieval of the displayed web page images citing col. 1, line 67 to col. 2 line 2 of  
21   Helfman.

22       Claim 1, in part, recites “wherein the central logging server logs requests  
23   for the first content in response to requests for the second content”. The Action  
24   argues that this element is disclosed in Helfman. As discussed above, Helfman  
25   discloses selecting images (second content). When images are selected, the client

1 browser uses the mapping list, which may be on the client or the proxy server, to  
2 determine the associated web page that contains the selected image. As discussed  
3 above, the mapping list described in Helfman pre-exists or is created prior to  
4 allowing the client to select an image. Otherwise, without the mapping list, when  
5 an image is chosen, there is no web page URL for which the client is directed to.  
6 In other words, when an image (second content) is selected or requested, there is  
7 no logging of the request for the web page (first content) by the proxy server  
8 (central logging server), as argued by the Action. The action performed is  
9 fetching a corresponding web page URL from the mapping list when an image is  
10 chosen.

11 In view of the above, Helfman does not teach or disclose each and every  
12 element of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Helfman. Applicant  
13 respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

14 **Dependent claims 2-7** are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency  
15 on base claim 1. Furthermore, as set forth below, particular dependent claims  
16 recite elements that are not taught or disclosed by Helfman.

17 Claim 4 further recites “wherein the central logging server logs information  
18 received in cookies accompanying the requests for the second content”. The  
19 Action argues that this element is disclosed by Helfman in “Col. 2 lines 1-2, Col 3  
20 lines 52-54, the logged URL to the images are retrieved from the webpage  
21 retrieved from the web server”. The cited section of Helfman, and Helfman in  
22 general, do not teach or disclose “cookies” and specifically the proxy server  
23 (central logging server) receiving cookies “accompanying the requests for the  
24 second content” as recited in claim 4.  
25

1 Claim 5 further recites “wherein the reference comprises a Hypertext  
2 Markup Language (HTML) tag”. The Action argues that that this element is  
3 disclosed by Helfman in “Col. 1 lines 21-24, URL of the images embedded in an  
4 HTML webpage is using HTML tags”. This cited section states that “[i]nlined  
5 images are a popular way in which to create eye-catching text and graphics that  
6 would be difficult or impossible to create using the capabilities of hypertext  
7 markup language (HTML)”. The preceding sentence describes that inlined images  
8 are images that appear on a web page with text. There is not teaching or  
9 disclosure in this section of Helfman, or Helfman in general, as to the URL  
10 comprising an HTML tag as argued by the Action.

11 Claim 7 further recites “wherein the references comprise references to one  
12 or more transparent graphic images”. The Action argues that this element is  
13 disclosed by Helfman in “Col 2 lines 60-65, transparent image is a popular type of  
14 a image object”; however, there is no teaching or disclosure in this section, or  
15 Helfman in general, as to a transparent image.

16 For the reasons discussed above, Helfman does not teach or disclose each  
17 and every element of claims 2-7. Thus claims 2-7 are not anticipated by Helfman.  
18 Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 2-7 be withdrawn.

19 **Independent claim 8**, recites in part “returning, in response to the requests,  
20 the requested first content, wherein said first content includes a reference to  
21 second content that causes information regarding the request for the first content to  
22 be logged at a remote logging server”. This element of claim 8 is rejected based  
23 on similar arguments in rejecting claim 1. Applicant presents the arguments  
24 presented in support of claim 1, in support of claim 8.  
25

1 In view of the above, Helfman does not teach or disclose each and every  
2 element of claim 8. Thus, claim 8 is not anticipated by Helfman. Applicant  
3 respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

4 **Dependent claims 9-16** are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency  
5 on base claim 8. Furthermore, as set forth below, particular dependent claims  
6 recite elements that are not taught or disclosed by Helfman.

7 Claim 10 further recites “wherein the second content comprises a  
8 transparent graphic image”. The Action rejects claim 10 based on similar  
9 arguments in rejecting claim 7. Applicant presents the arguments presented in  
10 support of claim 7, in support of claim 10.

11 Claim 14 further recites “wherein the reference comprises a Hypertext  
12 Markup Language (HTML) tag”. The Action rejects claim 14 based on similar  
13 arguments in rejecting claim 5. Applicant presents the arguments presented in  
14 support of claim 5, in support of claim 14.

15 Claim 15 further recites “wherein the second content comprises a web  
16 page”. The Action argues that the images are “second content” and that the web  
17 pages are “first content”; however, the Action in rejecting claim 15 now argues  
18 that the “second content” includes web pages; however, this is not taught or  
19 disclosed in Helfman.

20 For the reasons discussed above, Helfman does not teach or disclose each  
21 and every element of claims 9-16. Thus claims 9-16 are not anticipated by  
22 Helfman. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 9-16 be  
23 withdrawn.  
24  
25

1           **35 U.S.C. §103**

2           Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
3 Helfman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,916 to Nguyen (Nguyen). Applicant  
4 respectfully traverses the rejection.

5           Claim 6 depends from claim 1, therefore include the element “wherein the  
6 central logging server logs requests for the first content in response to requests for  
7 the second content”. As discussed above, Helfman fails to teach that the proxy  
8 server (central logging server) logs the request for the web page (first content) in  
9 response to requests for the images (second content). Nguyen is cited for its  
10 teaching that the “web server logs user requests locally”; however, Nguyen  
11 provides no assistance in light of Helfman as to the recited system of claim 6.

12           In view of the above, the combination of Helfman and Nguyen does not  
13 teach or suggest each and every element of claim 6. Thus, claim 6 is not obvious  
14 over the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection  
15 of claim 6 be withdrawn.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 All pending claims 1-11 and 14-16 are in condition for allowance.  
3 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject  
4 application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the  
5 Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent  
6 Action.

7  
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9  
10 Dated: 4/14/06

By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera  
Reg. No. 45,760  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245